

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
COMP PLAN UPDATE
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2003**

City Hall Council Chambers
210 East 13th Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the City Hall Council Chambers, 210 East 13th Street, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Ron Barca, Dick Deleissegues, Jada Rupley, Lonnie Moss, Carey Smith, and Vaughn Lein, Chairman.

Members Absent: Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Pat Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; Colette Anderson, Planner II; Derek Chisholm, Planner II; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 9, 2003

The agenda for October 9, 2003, was approved as distributed.

B. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, continued from October 2, 2003:

PLEASE NOTE: There will be continued testimony taken from property owners on requested changes in land use designations.

The hearing segment on the Capital Facilities Analysis and Plan will be continued to October 16, 2003 at the Public Services Building, BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor at 6:30 p.m.

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

- Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.
- Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.
- Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.
- A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.

LEIN: We will continue on with the public hearing item. As Mr. Lee indicated, we were supposed to be into another part of the hearing which was the capital facilities analysis plan, we currently are on site-specific requests. Last week we went through two pages of the sign-up sheets, we still have four sheets of sign-ups before us.

One of the things we're going to do in terms of a change this evening is we will ask people to come forward for their public testimony. I will read three names, the first name will be the person that we expect to come forward with the initial testimony, the other two we'd like you to come forward and seat on the last two chairs on the right so that you're ready to do your testimony after the first one. So after a person steps down I will state another name so we always have two people seated to be continued. If you

do not want to participate when I say your name, please indicate no so that we are able to continue on.

We also have a timer. We apologize that we're going to have to do that, but these hearings are going considerably longer than what we anticipated. We do want to hear your comments. If you have written statements, please make sure we receive those. We would ask that you summarize those if at all possible. And we understand that sometimes you feel more comfortable reading it, but we will always limit it to the five minutes that we've been. If you are representing more than one client, we will allow you five minutes for each client and we would ask also that if you could make it briefer, we would appreciate that aspect of it too.

So we will go until about 8:00, that will give us an indication of how quickly some of this is going and then we will make a determination how far we think we're going to get through the evening. My concern, again, is we have four pages, we went through two last hearing, but I understand in looking at this we don't have as many attorneys available tonight so that should improve things quite well. I'd like to start with a gentleman that we didn't get to last time because of time and I understand he has a need to be here and then out because of a disability. Mr. Lasch, are you here?

TOWNE: Excuse me, Vaughn, I was going to --

LEIN: Yes, I'm sorry, we need to have a little bit of a staff report first, I apologize.

TOWNE: Sandra Towne, Clark County Long-Range Planning. I wanted to just give a little background to the site-specific requests, a little bit on the process, as well as the review process that the staff accomplished. The Board of Clark County Commissioners suspended the annual review process while the County was engaged in this extensive 10-year review of the 20-year growth management plan. The amendment dockets process remained in place, however, and each year staff docketed requests, based on specific criteria the Board determined which dockets would be forwarded to be placed on staff work program that year and then be before the Planning Commission to consider. All of the remaining requests that were not docketed, were not sent forward, were retained and those are the requests that we have dubbed site-specific requests, or SSRs is what I'm going to call them this evening. Staff generated a file for each one of these site-specific requests and upon receipt we filed them, we confirmed, we sent confirmation letters to the person who requested them. We've also during the whole process of the comprehensive plan had open houses where these property owners were able to follow the process and see where their request was falling within the proposals and alternatives that were coming out of the planning process and also had opportunities to comment.

On September 17th of this year letters were mailed to each of the property owners that had a site-specific request filed and those were up until September 10th. Anything that

came in after September 10th would not have received a letter, but those are going forward and being given to the Planning Commission to consider. The review process, the SSRs were considered -- I'm sorry, the SSRs were considered in developing the proposed plan. The planning process has focused primarily on the issue of urban land supply, and since the proposed plan calls for additional urban lands those site-specific requests adjacent or very near the existing urban growth boundaries were considered.

Now the 20-year urban land supply assumes that vacant and underutilized lands within the existing urban growth areas would develop under existing zoning densities; therefore, the plan did not look at those requests inside urban growth areas to change. In addition, the 20-year proposed plan assumes a reduced rural population split of 10 percent rural growth and 90 percent urban; therefore, the requests out in the rural area were not determined a part of this proposed plan because we did not need to look for additional densities in the rural area.

Some quick information about how many we received and how many were included in the proposed plan. There were 261 requests as of September 10th, 109 of those were looked at as a part of this proposed plan because they were near the urban growth boundary areas or adjacent to them. And of those 109 requests, 63 of them were given, were actually changed, they had designation and zoning changes, and that equals to be about 2200 acres. So about 2200 acres of the changes or the requests have been changed and then 46 of them were not and that was about 1500 acres. So tonight we're inviting property owners and/or their representatives to testify in front of the Planning Commission. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Towne before we continue on with the public hearing? Okay. Mr. Lasch, to be followed by Mr. Howsley, to be followed by Mr. Schaefer.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

LASCH: Good evening. My name is Henry Lasch and I live at 15406 NW 11th Avenue. I have prepared a package for you and I don't know if you have it with you this evening, it was sent in a couple of days ago by way of E-mail, there is a map in the last part that demonstrates the area that we're discussing. And specifically it's a stretch of land on NW 11th Avenue between 149th Street and 164th. I know you want everybody to be brief this evening so I'm just going to point out that this stretch of land is less than a mile long and NW 11th Avenue has traditionally been the alternate route to the fairgrounds area. Well, we all know that we've had an explosion of activity up there. In my package to you I've pointed out where some of the amphitheater traffic, which is only supposed to go out on 179th Street to I-5, has in fact been routed north and south on NW 11th already due to congestion problems.

LEE: Excuse me, Mr. Lasch, I just want to point out that in the package we gave you

tonight it's Number 174.

LASCH: Thank you. So the NW 11th Avenue, as I said, been traditionally the back door to the fairgrounds and the largest development out there is the amphitheater and it's already been in violation of the CUP as far as routing traffic out, it became more expedient on two nights to put that traffic up and down NW 11th Avenue. I've also gone to some of the hearings, or open houses rather, for the sports complex, and that is an 88-acre park that is going to be created on what would be the southwest side of the fairgrounds property. If you look at the huge, the block that the fairgrounds occupies, that's set up to have about a dozen or so full-sized courts for multi-sports, soccer and so forth. There is no solution to the additional traffic for this project, so far I've not been able to find any, but I keep thinking that more and more of this is going to be routed on NW 11th as the number of large projects go up there. Also there's a letter in there which Tom Musser sent out to the Fairgrounds Association talking about the schedule for the implementation of a very large Expo building, and I'm referring to the type of buildings that you see across the river where they had the various shows, the RV shows, the gun shows, you're all familiar with them, well, we're going to have one of those up on that area at the north end of NW 11th.

I'd like to drop south for a minute to the Salmon Creek area. In the 20-year plan the Salmon Creek area has determined to be the second largest urban area in Southwest Washington, and as a result we're all familiar with the Fred Meyer's on 134th Street, the congestion that has gone on around 134th Street. I believe that in front of the planning board Alexandria Investments was in front of you today or it was scheduled to be today and they're talking about a big box home improvement kind of store which is situated in the same area around the Fred Meyer's. The residential growth has been absolutely explosive, it has followed the back route to the fairgrounds, the urban growth boundary is just slightly north of 149th, the only non -- the only area not in the urban growth boundary providing this southern access is NW 11th, it is destined to remain a rural two-lane road with the ditches along the side to get the water out.

The traffic has started to expand more and more every day as we go by, and with the growth plan for what's going on at the southern end and the northern end, and the fact that as soon as the Fred Meyer store has opened up the people who live north and west of I-5 from south of Ridgefield use our back roads to come down and go to the Fred Meyer's complex and avoid unpleasantness at the 179th. So the traffic is expediential and tonight I'd like you to -- well, just give me one second, last week --

LEIN: Could you make your conclusions, Mr. Lasch.

LASCH: Yes, I will.

LEIN: Thank you.

LASCH: Last week a gentleman testified that he felt like he was in limbo. He lives up by the fairgrounds and he was talking about his property. 10 years ago when we went through this process the first time the property along 11th was designated as urban reserve and it had an underlying promise to us, if you will, that when the boundary moves again, it would move and encompass our area. That was the purpose of being reserve. Well, so far in the plan as we see it here that's also being designated as urban reserve again and it's hard to live there when you don't know how much money to put in your property and what's going to change, as he pointed out quite well. So briefly if you've got a chance to look at my packet, you'll see all the supporting information. I would like to see the urban growth boundary expanded up to 164th so when it encompasses the area, abutters up along NW 11th Avenue and give us the road improvements so that it will allow that to remain a viable route from north to south. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Any questions from members of the Commission?

RUPLEY: Mr. Lasch, I'm sorry that I didn't get to meet you before because I was one of those cars on 11th after Jimmy Buffet.

LASCH: Yeah. Well, wave and honk the horn when you go by. Thank you.

BARCA: Sandra, would you point out the existing urban growth boundary in relationship to the property, please.

TOWNE: I don't know if it's on this map. 179th is up further I believe.

LASCH: I can point it out to you on this if you'd like.

TOWNE: This is 119th down here, I'm sorry, right here, so 179th is way off this map, but I could show you here.

LASCH: Who asked that question if I may?

BARCA: I asked the question.

LASCH: Here it is. Here in the packet you'll see the -- but that's basically the area, it's the urban growth boundary at 149th.

BARCA: So it encompasses -- it's still within what is the reserve?

LASCH: Yes. It has been reserve and it's destined to be reserve.

BARCA: This is in my packet, thanks.

LASCH: Yes, it is.

LEIN: We have Mr. Howsley and then Mr. Schaefer. And is Stan Giersdorf here? Okay. If not, George Carambot. For those of you who just stepped in, we're asking for the main speaker and then the following two to come forward. Mr. Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Okay. Yes, for the record, James Howsley, attorney with Lane, Powell, Spears, Lubersky, 601 SW Second Avenue, Suite 2100, Portland, Oregon 97204. I just want to thank the Planning Commission again for being in front of them again. Just real briefly, I actually have 14 requests, but 5 of them I'm not going to testify to tonight. I gave you another booklet as a companion to the other one, I would just have you guys review that at your leisure. And just reading those into the record it's request 2001-073, 2001-076, 2001-074, 2001-007 and 2001-028. The first request --

LEIN: Mr. Howsley, excuse me, that's the newest book that you just gave us; correct?

HOWSLEY: That is the newest book, correct.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

HOWSLEY: Returning to the old book from last week, going down through order, I'm going to have six that will be basically urban boundary requests, one or two rural land requests, and a last one that will be an inside the boundary, current inside the Vancouver UGA request.

The first request I have tonight is the Ron Warman request, that is 2001-080 site-specific review. The location of it is up there on the map, it's basically up in what we refer to as the Green Mountain area off of Ingle Road in Camas. The site-specific request is to go from Agricultural to Urban Low Residential. Basically in November our office -- in November of 2000 our office filed a request with the City of Camas and then followed that up to the County in 2001 for the inclusion of this within the Camas urban growth area. The preferred alternative shows a part of Mr. Warman's property coming in the boundary as park land. And that would be essentially the finger portion on the south side of Ingle Road that currently is a private water ski lake. The park designation wouldn't be inconsistent with that considering it's currently used for recreational purposes; however, as you can see, Mr. Warman's property crosses NE Ingle Road. The City of Camas testified two weeks ago that they recommended the Green Mountain area to come inside the Camas urban growth area. In lieu of that they requested an urban reserve designation.

Essentially my client is hoping to -- he already has a house existing on it, he would like to build another personal residence on the property. This can either be accomplished by two means; one is moving it inside the Camas urban boundary, or, secondly, through a rural request amendment to go to Rural 5 considering there's about 11 or so acres

there. The value of this property for productive long-term agricultural use is not great. As you can see, most of it is in fact a water ski lake and there's only a very small portion on the other side of Ingle Road that has the dollar loam soil type which isn't a very productive soil type, it's really only used for hay or pasture and given the size of the property it's not productive. So we therefore ask that the Planning Commission either recommend this inclusion within the Camas urban boundary with an urban low residential designation or in lieu of that have a Rural 5 change. Are there any questions on this one?

LEIN: I guess not.

HOWSLEY: Okay. The next request tonight is for the May Family Trust. This is site-specific review 2000-021. You'll also find this in the book. A request was made to the County in 2000 for the inclusion of this property either within the Camas or the city of Vancouver urban growth area with a commercial comprehensive plan designation. Essentially the property is located on the northeast corner of 1st and 192nd there. It's the small 3-acre parcel. This property is included in the County's preferred alternative as a commercial property. The property was in kind of the infamous no man's land swale area, that there was much discussion between the City of Vancouver and the City of Camas. As stated two weeks ago by both of those Cities, a compromise position was struck within that area and it is recommended that this property come inside the Vancouver urban growth area. We support the preferred alternative and the compromise position and we ask that the Planning Commission recommend this forward to the Board with a comprehensive plan designation of Community Commercial and a C-3 zoning. Any questions on this one? Okay.

The third request is the Bakker Living Trust request. This is site-specific review 2000-003. We represent the Bakker Living Trust with this request. The property is located north of the terminus of 192nd Avenue and to the south of Lacamas Creek. I want to make a very clear point that it does not cross Lacamas Creek. This request is also being made pursuant to a settlement between our client and the County under the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board stipulated order of dismissal which you'll find a copy of that inside the book. The property is approximately 86 acres in size and currently touches the western boundary of the existing urban growth area. And if, Kathy, could you please put up the visual. You'll find a copy of this within the booklet as well. The preferred alternative includes this parcel inside the city of Vancouver's urban growth area with a comprehensive plan designation of Urban Low Residential. We support the preferred alternative and ask that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board the inclusion of this parcel with the designation as shown on the preferred alternative. We've taken the time to consider the environmental impacts of the land due to the creek being there as well as some wetlands being located on the site. We've had our wetlands guy go out and delineate where it is. And as you can see both on in front of you as well as in the folder that it can accommodate anywhere from 116 to 166 single-family dwelling units as well as 47 to 70

multi-family units and that's the proposal that we would propose for that site. Is there any questions on this one? Okay.

The next request is site-specific review request 2003-014AA. And this one we represent the Germann family and this is a site-specific review request to be included with inside the Vancouver urban growth area. We submitted this request to the County in the November of 2002 and it was placed on the docket as a 2003 request. This one has just changed pretty recently. There originally are three parcels that were to be included within this request, as well there's an odd-shaped parcel just to the south there that will also be included within this request pursuant to an amendment that I'll be submitting later.

LEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Howsley, when you say "additional" is that shown on this piece here?

HOWSLEY: Yeah, it's this parcel here.

LEIN: Okay. The larger of that group?

HOWSLEY: Yes.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

HOWSLEY: The parcels minus that one collectively make up about 57 acres. They're located off of Ward Road to the south of 99th Street. They are in the Hockinson School District; therefore, residential expansion wouldn't overburden the Evergreen School District. We are requesting the inclusion of this within the Vancouver urban boundary as Urban Low Residential. Currently it has an Ag zoning, but it has an Urban Reserve overlay. And it's had that since 1994. The Germanns anticipated that they would be included within the expansion this time because of the property consisted of urban reserve from 1994. Last week I testified with general concerns that we have with the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the preferred alternative and without rehashing that testimony, you know, we believe there's a need to have an additional residential lands, not that much, but additional residential lands coming in and this would account for those additional lands. We ask that the Planning Commission essentially recommend that these properties be included within the boundary to compensate for the shortfall. And within the packet as well as in front of you up there, you can see a proposal by Olson Engineering for the property. It would be -- it could accommodate anywhere from 210 to 300 units or approximately 565 to 807 people based on 2.69 persons per household. Any questions with this one?

BARCA: On your Olson Engineering proposal there's a large green rectangle.

HOWSLEY: Yeah, I neglected to say that. One of the conditions of the sale of this

property would be a dedication of a park, either it would be private and maintained in the development or it would be dedicated to the County on behalf of the Germann family.

BARCA: So that's a family commitment towards the aspect of --

HOWSLEY: Yes, it is.

BARCA: -- changing the property?

HOWSLEY: It's a family commitment.

BARCA: Thank you.

HOWSLEY: Yes. The next request is the Zilke request. It's site-specific review 2001 Numbers 037, 038 and 039. The property within this request are located to the south of 119th Street and to the west of 152nd Avenue. Kathy, if you can put up the proposal as well. The map that's in the book as well as the one that Kathy is putting up shows properties that are within this conglomeration. The properties to the west and that little funny one up there on the north end is properties owned by Jim and Rosemary Parker which Steve Horenstein testified to last week. They're a part of this cooperation, cooperative request. In the book you'll find a detailed narrative and a GIS packet as well as a copy of the proposed site plan. As you can see this site has quite a few wetlands that would make it hard to work around. The County's preferred alternative shows these properties included within the Vancouver urban expansion area as Business Park. We ask that the Planning Commission reconsider this and make a recommendation to move this inside the boundary as Urban Low Residential.

Last week, the last couple of weeks, you've heard extensive testimony from the neighborhood associations to the south about their concerns with the business park designation. They stated essentially that they'd rather see residential out there, that there's more appropriate places for the business park designation. We also believe that residential is a much better adjacent use than the business park or mixed use designation. Like I stated before, as you can see the parcels are covered with wetlands. These are low quality wetlands. The ground is very flat which would make it very good to develop housing, but not much else. Therefore, we'd just ask that the Planning Commission recommend this one to go forward as an Urban Low request.

LEIN: Any questions?

BARCA: How many units?

HOWSLEY: This one would propose, if you can hold on a second, with all of these it's hard to keep all the numbers straight sometimes. The single-family could yield

approximately 454 to 650 units of single-family. There's two multi-family zones that we would propose in this thing, they could accommodate 36 to 54 in the R-12 and approximately 126 units in the R-18. And you can find a copy of that on the Olson site plan on the side if you need further clarification.

BARCA: Thank you.

HOWSLEY: The next request is the Jochim site-specific review. That's 2003-016AA. This parcel is located just to the west of the Renaissance parcel that I testified to last week and it's located along 179th Street. It is approximately 15 acres in size and has a current comprehensive plan designation of Urban Reserve. We're requesting that this property be brought into the Vancouver urban growth area with an Urban Low Residential designation. This parcel is included within the County's preferred alternative. The County is proposing a comprehensive plan designation of Mixed Use. If it were in fact urban low residential, it could accommodate anywhere from 51 to 73 residential units.

LEIN: Any questions?

HOWSLEY: That concludes the urban area requests. Last week I accidentally submitted into the record a letter that I think that I had Mr. Dust hand you another copy of. This is specifically in regards to the Casey Collins site-specific review request Number 2001-017. We represent Mr. Collins and some others. Their property is located off of Highway 99 to the east on the south side of 72nd Street along 12th Avenue. The subject properties are approximately 58,146-square feet in size. They have a current comprehensive plan designation of Urban Medium Residential and are zoned Residential. We're requesting a designation of Office Campus. You can please feel free to read the letter as a justification why these and a couple of other requests should be heard and listened to during this process, and I would like to go ahead and readopt some of the arguments made by Ms. Bremer and others last week about why some of the requests inside the boundary should be heard during this process rather than having to wait another year. Essentially granting this request will allow for job creation. It will maintain a transition zone between the uses in the area and it will promote a higher and better use along the Highway 99 corridor.

LEIN: Any questions?

BARCA: Is that pen pointed specifically to the parcel?

HOWSLEY: If you can see where it's dotted.

BARCA: Oh, okay. Where it's dotted?

HOWSLEY: Yeah, those are the parcels as part of this request. The narrative explains

a little bit more detail and obviously for time purposes I'll just let you read it at your convenience.

The next request is the Holsinger site-specific review request. This request originally we submitted to the City of Battle Ground for inclusion with inside their urban growth area due to the eventual development of the 219th Street Interchange on SR-503. Obviously Battle Ground hasn't proposed that and the County hasn't proposed that as an alternative, so in lieu of that original request we ask that the property become Rural Center to allowed to be developed as a commercial use. It's going to be a very important intersection once that interchange does go in within the next few years. That's Mr. Holsinger, Don Holsinger. I don't have the number on that one, I'm sorry.

LEIN: It's 036. It's 2001-036.

HOWSLEY: And then the final request that I have to talk to you about orally tonight is site-specific review request 2003-001 actually. Again in the notebook please find a detailed narrative and the GIS packet for this property. This property is located at 4604 NW 289th Street in Ridgefield. It has a current comprehensive plan designation of Ag with an Ag-20 zoning. It is approximately 30 acres in size and we're requesting an amendment to be R-5. There is an existing farmhouse on the south end of the parcel. Again, in order to save the Planning Commission's valuable time I would like to adopt by reference arguments made to the Planning Commission last week by Ms. Bremer with regards to the MacDonald site-specific request on why additional rural lands are needed.

Currently the property doesn't meet the GMA definitions or criteria for Ag land. GMA provides specifically that agricultural land must primarily be devoted to commercial production and such property must have long-term commercial significance. By "long-term production" that includes the growing capacity, productivity, the soil composition of the land for the long-term commercial production of an agricultural product. And the WAC further provides other criteria to look at in terms of evaluating whether a site is appropriate for agricultural use. Those include quality soils, the predominant parcel size, land use settlement patterns and compatibility with ag practices surrounding the area and the intensity of nearby land uses. This site has 59 percent of it is covered with the soil type CvA which is a cove series of soil, that is classified as a hydric. The remaining soil is SIB which is a part of the sara series which is not hydric but it is poorly suited for agricultural purposes. Adjacent to the parcel to the west as well as to the north and kind of up to the northeast corner is land designated with the Rural-5 designation, so amending this to be Rural-5 (inaudible) to a spot zone in the area. In conclusion we ask that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the Anderson parcel have a designation change from Ag to Rural-5.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Howsley?

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you very much.

HOWSLEY: Hopefully you won't get too many more lawyers tonight.

LEIN: Okay. After Mr. Schaefer we have Chris Swindell and Doug Ballou. Are they here? Is Mr. Ballou here this evening? Okay. Then we'll have Roger Alfred. Is he here? And then Vern Veysey. Go ahead, Mr. Schaefer.

SCHAEFER: My name is Robert Schaefer and I'm the attorney for the Philbrook family who have the property here that has been designated as Mixed Use Business Park, Office Campus, and we are requesting that it be brought in with the urban service area. We feel that what the County and the Planning Commission are being forced into doing in, at least I think you feel that way, is that you take the largest vacant parcels and try to make them into industrial lands or business parks to try to generate the job ratio that has been outlined for us. When we were developing all of the Cascade Park and all of the industries east of Vancouver, and I was involved with those, we found that the larger parcels as long as the sewer, the public sewer, water and all of the amenities were provided that the areas that really were outside the urban service boundaries, that were out, that and where that the developers or the industries wanted to come into our county were willing to put up the adequate infrastructure that this was a much better way of going and this was the only way that we could attract these types of industries. You talked about the I-5 corridor situation and I think that what we must look at in our county is to do away with this urban boundary situation and maybe have a provision that provides for where you have to have adequate sewer, water, and all of the amenities that we want to provide the proper neighborhoods and help in traffic control.

In this particular case you have a neighborhood in this particular area that has been developed, and you heard all this testimony last week, and I think you've heard it during these things that these people who bought in those areas developed those neighborhoods expected to see residential, low density residential be continued. If we do what we're doing now and we take parcels like the Philbrook property and develop it into business parks or what we call a campus, near the campus facility to supplement business for the Washington State Campus, then what kind of message are we sending when Washington State University in talking to Hal Dengerink tells me that they are looking to having a business park adjacent to the campus.

Now this parcel that we're looking at here that you're considering as a business park for campus offices is over a mile away and on the other side of Salmon Creek and the neighbors don't want that. The schools have planned for adequately in the area and if we are going to look at these things properly, to me we have to look at what the campus is planning in this area and what are some of the other plans of people we have already

established or institutions we've already established in the area. It is my hope that in your deliberation on this that you will recognize the neighbors and that we won't be establishing a precedent if I develop a home out in a residential neighborhood where there is some vacant property that I am not threatened to have an office park across the street, that I am looking for a particular area. And one of the reasons those people went in this area was that they knew the owners of the property. The Philbrooks wanted to when they made their conversion from farming to go into another use that they would -- they had planned to use it for residential and so that they had those types of assurances. If we take away those assurances of the neighbors and people who are developing residential communities, then I think we're taking away something we don't want to take away in this county.

I think there are ways to provide those jobs in these urban areas and that is to look back at the corridor and put some requirements that if I provide adequate roads, the sewer, the proper drainage and the utilities, that we will then be able to expand into the areas outside the urban boundaries and it is up to the City and the County to work out the proper tax division in these businesses so it isn't a taxing question, it's really a zoning question. Thank you very much. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Schaefer? Thank you. Okay. Mr. Swindell. And John Philbrook, is he here?

PHILBROOK: I'm here, John Philbrook, and my attorney just spoke for me.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. And then Michelle Cotner.

SWINDELL: Well, I don't suppose you can see much of that, but I can kind of point it out to you. If you'll look in your packets there that you just got -- by the way I'm Chris Swindell, 1007 NE 264th Street, Pioneer, Ridgefield. If you'll look on the last page of that booklet, you'll see a picture. This was Pioneer in 1940 or thereabouts, that's where my business park is. I have a building there on 1.88 acres, it was built in 1995, I had rural commercial zoning. Halfway through building the building -- after all the approvals and everything that Clark County having the zoning for 20 years and waiting for PUD water, I started the building and halfway through it the County unbeknownst to me took my zoning away. Why I don't know other than growth management. I'm not a big fan of growth management because of that. I have a half million dollar investment that if it burns down I cannot rebuild. That is my retirement and my pension.

And anyways, I'm here to ask you to let me go into the Ridgefield growth boundary area. They have agreed to take me and to give my zoning back. Ridgefield touches my property, takes in 30 feet of it right now. They took in the whole 10th Avenue which my property line goes to the center of, which on this map, if you want to look at it I'll give it to you and you can have it and the pictures and everything else. Right across the street from me is a 20-acre building known as Dollar Tree. They're building that on a 54-acre

site. There will be 500 trucks across there. Also on the intersection there there will be a PUD substation right across the street from my building. The fire department is on the other corner plus the old pioneer store, they're trying to come into Ridgefield's growth planning area too. But anyway, I'm just asking you to fix a wrong that was done I believe seven years ago and if that's possible, well, I would appreciate it. You have everything in the packet and all the information. There's a lot of people here that have got lots to say so I'm not going to say much more. Anybody got any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Swindell?

SWINDELL: Would you like to keep this so you can look at it later? I have other pictures.

LEIN: I think we've got enough information in the packet that you've provided. Thank you.

SWINDELL: Okay. Thank you.

LEIN: Is there a Norman Klaus or the address is 1245 East Caples? Chuck Milligraudt, Milgraudt, the address 4309 NE 39th Street? Okay. Mr. or Mrs. R. Mulford. Striking out here. Don Collins. George Schumaker. After that Joseph Lear. Is Joseph Lear here? And then Mike Bashor. Thank you.

SCHUMAKER: My name is George Schumaker, address, mailing address 2719 NE 93rd Avenue. I want to thank the Planning Commission to allow me to present my property for reconsideration for rezoning. My parcel is currently in the R-5 residential area zoning and I'd like to bring it into the urban growth boundary. The property is located on map Section 5, Area 21. Geographically street map area would be NW 279th Street and NW 66th Avenue. This parcel of property is approximately 45 acres. It's currently in current use agriculture with the parameter properties R-5 on the north and LDR 7.5 to 8.5 on the south. The property is directly attached to the Heron Ridge subdivision and it has -- some of the acreage of this parcel is within the Ridgefield city limits.

The rationale for changing the zoning on this is the property no longer is maintaining farm commercial significance due to poor soil quality. It has saras type soil, also high predator pressure on crops from the game refuge which is increasing due to lack of hunters coming into that area, also increasing intensity of urban type of individuals moving into that area. Also the rationale for changing this is there's no preexisting homes on this site, it would be efficient to develop this in a more organized development and it has good potential for public utility service. In conclusion, this would be a good replacement for the loss of urbanized developed land such as Heron Ridge and Bellwood Heights and I'd like to promote the more traditional development in Ridgefield to a more parabolic manner and I'd like to propose to move my farming operation further

out and therefore I'm requesting a zone change to its best use. Thank you.

LEIN: Mr. Schumaker, on one of the maps or the aerial that you have here it appears there's a school to the east of you; is that correct?

SCHUMAKER: That's not a school. I can hear school children in the elementary school from my property, but that is just a portion of the city limits of Ridgefield and Main Street.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Thank you. Joseph Lear, then Mike Bashor, Eugene, Z-i-n-e-k, Zinek. Okay.

LEAR: Good evening, my name is Joe Lear. I live at 17640 NE 120th Avenue. I am the developer of Wind Song Acres. I left a map for each of you last meeting but did not have time to speak. Wind Song Acres is situated in the center of the map. Do you have that map?

LEIN: It's probably here. What's the case?

BARCA: There it is. It's right up there.

LEIN: Okay, that's the easiest way.

LEAR: Each area in the immediate vicinity of Wind Song Acres has been noted as the proposed comp plan zone. I am requesting that the 6 acres bordered on the north by NE 179th Street, on the west by NE 120th Avenue, and on the east by SR-503 be zoned highway commercial. When WSDOT built NE 120th Avenue just west of SR-503 and south of NE 179th Street, they envisioned that NE 120th Avenue would tie back into SR-503 south of the existing end of the road. One of the reasons WSDOT stated was to maintain a sufficiently high water flow and increase fire protection. NE 120th Avenue was originally indicated as a frontage road by WSDOT. This would indicate a tie-in back to SR-503. The property that is shown on the east side of SR-503 at NE 179th Street on your map is shown on your map as residential which changed to commercial three years ago and is due to be built on soon. The 6 acres highlighted on the map and located at the southwest corner of SR-503 and NE 179th Street should be zoned highway commercial. It has (inaudible) of frontage on SR-503 and on NE 120th Avenue. All utilities are in, including sewer. It is not suitable for single-family residential. Industrial is located on the north and on the south of this 6 acres. The highway noise is also too loud for a single-family residential. Commercial zoning is best to create jobs.

This 6 acres was requested to be changed to commercial three years ago via a site-specific request. Your previous map showed this site-specific request. Again, I request this 6 acres be zoned highway commercial with the extension of NE 120th

Avenue, this would create a great job center. The remaining 30 acres known as Wind Song Acres should be zoned R1-5 density residential. There are areas -- there are forested wetlands on the property that would work as a natural greenbelt. A well-known developer is ready to pursue this zoning. Thank you. Are there any questions?

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Lear? Thank you. Mr. Bashor. The third one will be Gordon Lewis.

BASHOR: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to being here this evening and I just want to say that I'm new to the planning process but my experience has been a good one. We've been here the last couple of weeks and I'm glad to be a citizen and resident of Clark County. I say my experience with Mr. Lee's staff downtown as they've been all very helpful and I appreciate they've gone I believe just beyond the letter of their work description so we feel we're off to a good start.

LEIN: Could you please state your address for the record.

BASHOR: Okay. My address is 6601 NE 144th, zip code 98686.

DELEISSEGUES: I'm sorry, but I didn't get your name.

BASHOR: Mike Bashor.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

BASHOR: Okay. Our property that we are requesting change for is right in this area off of Edmunds Road and 182nd Avenue and we have a fact sheet included in here which is the parcel numbers 8.6 acres, it's current existing land use is Ag-20 and its proper -- it's currently used as a farm. The surrounding properties are listed as R1-6 farming and residential and we're proposing inclusion in the urban growth boundary and with an urban reserve designation if possible.

Now on the first page we have a letter from the current landowner Mr. Andersen who is going to be donating this property to us, we're in the process of that, and he makes seven points, seven reasons for including this land in the boundary, but on the second page is just a property fact sheet, then the next three pages just a little bit about the church, and then there's a zone designation page shows the Ag-20 and the residential following which is a water, sewer, storm system which is very important because it comes right up to our boundary. And then notice the upper north part of our property does have some environmental constraints and then it also has some habitat issues that we're dealing with. Then we have a letter from our architect Mr. Foster recommending urban reserve if possible. Then I hope you have included in there a letter from the City of Vancouver, it should be loose in the back, which we've requested, they're willing and able to service our property with sewer.

Turning back to the first page, just seven quick reasons why we would like to be included in the urban growth boundary is that it would generate some additional fees for the County. There's potential conditional use permit for All Nations Worship Center, an urban use instead of in the urban area instead of in the rural area and our main point is we think it would be extremely advantageous for this bordering on this environmental lowlands to be on a sewer instead of a septic and because of its significance in the habitat and wetland buffer areas. And so this would decrease environmental impacts to our immediate area. And since our property line borders the urban growth boundary it's contiguous and the utilities services are right there as well. And I would like to -- Mr. Zinck is yielding his position, his opportunity, to our civil engineer Mr. Bob Rodgers and he has some more information for us here.

LEIN: Okay.

RODGERS: Good evening, Commissioners, my name is Bob Rodgers. My address is 16019 NE 145th Avenue, Brush Prairie. Could you please put the other overlay up. I'm going to talk on this site here. We're bordered on the south by a subdivision R1-6, we have a road that's coming right up to the middle part of the site there, it's already fully built out with sewer there that can serve the site. We have a letter from the City of Vancouver willing to give us service but we have to go through planning considerations like we're doing tonight, but they could, don't even have to extend a main in there, just a lateral to service our site, which we feel would be better than putting a large septic system in there, would have less impacts, potential impacts. The upper part of this site where the church is is a higher area, it comes up and then it drops down to the low area below, so we have one -- about a half of the site that's buildable and then the lower area where we have floodplain and low areas and wetlands and things like that. The other corner of our site actually may be in part of the urban growth service area, the little corner to the west, already, and we're in the process of looking at that. We would like to also use the church as a steppingstone for an educational research for environmental and natural resources in the farming community and this is kind of would be an interface between urban and resource lands here in a spiritual way possibly.

On our other side we have access out onto -- on the west side of the corner there we have access out onto the County road, plus we have access on the east side. So we have utilities all around us, water and sewer, we have all the urban services right up to our boundary, and if you'd almost extend some of the business park, if somebody had slipped on the mouse at GIS, they would almost come down and put us into business park, we're awful close to what that was, but since we're going to be a church it would be a conditional use permit so we could be in any zone, but we're willing to discuss that with the long-range planners and see what may be the best land use zoning designation. That's all I have to say. Is there any questions?

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission?

BARCA: In the packet that was provided you have a habitat map that shows Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife priority species buffer that seems to sweep across this piece of property.

RODGERS: Yes. Yes, we do. And we have -- we're bringing a biologist on board and have been dealing with Dave Howe, we've gone through a pre-app and our -- the place where we're going to put the building on is on the high side and then the lowlands are about halfway down so we would actually not be impacting the lower area down there. But we're willing to do mitigation and what we need to do to, plantings and things like that, and then also the continuation of education and maybe more plantings and more work with habitat and creating more habitat in the area. An opportunity I think for that area to have habitat put in there because the lower area is more of farm fields with reed canary grass and things like that, and ditches going through it so if we can get in there and work with some of these floodplains and wetlands and things like that and make them a -- make them even better by implementing maybe plantings.

Let's just take for example the reed canary grass. We can plant cuttings in there like willows and red Kausa dogwood and things like that that can change the makeup and get more habitat. If it just lays like it is now, it's going to be reed canary grass down there. So we feel that and we're proposing to do that with the County already to go in and improve the habitat and work with Dave Howe on that.

BARCA: How many acres is your proposed development for the church grounds itself?

RODGERS: Just looking at the map the whole thing is 8.6 so probably 3 or 4 acres. I'd have to sit down and probably have it figured out somewhere, but I'd say 35 to 40 percent of the site, so the remaining part we want to improve and use as part of our program like Pastor Mike Bashor in his program to educate people about natural resources and ways that we can work and interface a residential area because we have a massive residential area around here that is developing and we just don't have those kind of services where there's an interrelation and also services for the community such as day-care but back into the environmental also with environmental education.

BARCA: Thank you.

MOSS: Mr. Rodgers, just to seek a point of clarification. In your packet there's also a letter from the Jolly-Foster Group and that has, oh, in recognition that the exact comp plan designation is something that you're not requesting I get at this particular time. I do have a highlighted area here saying that urban reserve would be appropriate for this. The request is to come inside the urban growth boundary, I assume that urban reserve is not the requested designation?

RODGERS: No. We're willing to work with the long-range planners on that. Our thing

is that we would like to get it into the service area so we can get served by sewer.

MOSS: Well, that would be my concern and that's that urban reserve really is a rural zone that sewer can't be provided in the rural area.

RODGERS: That may be another mistake then, but we would I think might be business park but conditional use permit can go into any zoning.

MOSS: The use that you're talking about could go into any zone either rural or urban, but sewer couldn't be provided outside the urban growth boundary.

RODGERS: Right. So we want to be included, our main request is to be included in the urban growth boundary.

MOSS: Thank you.

RODGERS: Sorry about that.

RUPLEY: I'm not sure if my question would be for you or for Mr. Bashor. You mentioned in here an education center, ten classrooms, how many students?

BASHOR: We're looking at a lower elementary school upwards of 200 students.

RUPLEY: 200 students. And then are you going to have bussing or are those parents going to be bringing those students?

BASHOR: It would be basically parent car pooling.

RUPLEY: Okay. And then child-care, day-care, how many were you looking at to do that?

BASHOR: Child-care would include the 200. That would be child-care and some early elementary education.

RUPLEY: Okay. So that's an after-school program then, you're not going to have youngsters --

BASHOR: It would be both.

RUPLEY: -- below school age?

BASHOR: Part of it would be designated for all day day-care of the 200 and then the rest would be for early elementary.

RUPLEY: Okay. And that would be parent pick up and drop off also?

BASHOR: Yes. Yes.

RUPLEY: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you. Gordon Lewis.

AUDIENCE: Not here.

LEIN: Charlie Parsons. Peter Sepicov. Lee or Leo Moon.

MOON: Here.

LEIN: Okay. After that Craig Clark. Is Craig Clark here? Okay. And then Gary Adkins. Is there a Gary Adkins here this evening? How about a John, how about this, B-o-u-c-m-i-e-r? Okay. Please proceed. Thank you.

MOON: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Lee Moon. My address is 11814 NE 177th Circle in Battle Ground. We are presently within the city limits but we are within the proposed urban growth boundary for Battle Ground in both the County and the City plan. You have some material that I've passed around, I'm not going to read that to you, I have some other remarks to make.

My husband of 30 years and I also had a plan, it was to work hard, raise our children to become productive adults, save some money along the way, build equity into our former home of 25 years and build our first brand-new home as a place to enjoy our upcoming retirement years together. We chose to move to Northern Clark County in August 2002 because of its unspoiled nature and affordable land. We found a one-acre lot for sale in an upscale development, Wind Song Acres, south of 179th and west of SR-503, had lots of Evergreen and deciduous trees, surrounding land was exactly what we had longed to enjoy. Cows graze a few hundred feet to the south and wooded areas abound to our west and north. The best part seemed that the remaining lots were divided into two and a half and five-acre parcels, zoned for single residence, construction purportedly with Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions that would limit tree removal to those trees necessary to site a house; thus, most of the trees would survive the building process and the woods would remain largely intact. It was perfect for us. We even paid more than the asking price to make certain that this lot would be ours.

Three months after we bought the parcel and hired an architect without our knowledge or consent the developer involved submitted a rezoning request to the County to downsize the larger lots to one-acre parcels with an apparent plan of subdividing further to 10,000-square foot lots. Absent this information we hired a contractor and sited our

custom home on the land so as to take full advantage of the wooded view to our west. This was a labor of love and there was, is, significant sweat equity in our home. We took occupancy in mid December 2002. Imagine our horror when we first learned of the developer's rezoning effort in mid June 2003, only later to discover that the County would like to allow one-acre lots to be subdivided into as little as 5,000-square foot lots at the owners discretion. If these lots are subdivided into 5,000 or 10,000-square feet, we cannot expect any of the trees to survive the construction process, it's a matter of space.

Instead we will have an unimpaired view of an urban neighborhood, likely of two-story starter homes. This is very much like the neighborhood that we left behind for something for rural. With the urbanizing of the area will come in inevitable increases in traffic noise and citified services such as wider roads, sidewalks, curbs, streetlights and the assessments that go with all of that. In our case we have about 500 linear feet of road frontage. (Inaudible) assessment burden we planned for as we transition into retirement. Do we truly need more saturated urban communities that have a high potential of transforming into blighted neighborhoods over the ensuing 10 to 20 years. As a matter of rebuttal regarding rezoning of some of that other land to highway commercial not being suitable for residential I would say that Maple Grove has built some nice homes on 189th east of 503 and it seems to work out just fine.

With this testimony we have tried to take you on a trip through our private nightmare because we know we share some version of this horror with a wide cross-section of what is presently unincorporated Clark County. We do realize this Board has to recommend to the County Commission a plan for a wide spectrum of a citizenry. We ask that you don't stomp on the hard won dreams of decent, hard working people for the sake of increasing property tax revenues. This isn't just a dollar and cents issue, it's also a quality of life issue. We ask that this development remain zoned as it is or certainly no less than one indivisible acre per home. Please remember there is a human factor in all of this. We ask that you keep that well in mind. Thank you.

LEIN: Are there questions of Ms. Moon?

BARCA: I would like it if you would point out your parcel that you're living on now in relationship to the map that's up there, please.

MOON: Certainly. We are right there.

BARCA: So you have two of your boundaries directly affected by the proposal?

MOON: Absolutely. On the other side of 120th is where other people believe it should be highway commercial and 120th should be extended as a frontage road. Certainly that would increase the traffic. And then on 177th Road that goes back to the rest of the lots. We were supposed to have something like 16 neighbors and now we're looking at

200.

TOWNE: That's 120th that I'm pointing to there.

BARCA: Okay. And the parcel that's in discussion for going to highway commercial?

MOON: Is right across where it says CR-1. I'm sorry, behind that. Yeah, right there where she's pointing.

TOWNE: Right here, these parcels.

BARCA: Okay.

MOON: All right. Any other questions?

BARCA: No, that clears it up for me. Thank you.

MOON: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Craig Clark. Don Kerkow. Excuse me. Are you Mr. Clark? Is Don Kerkow here tonight? Okay, thank you. Sarah Munson. Okay, thank you. I'm sorry, go ahead, Mr. Clark.

MACE: No, my name is Delvin Mace, I'm an architect representing Mr. Clark and Mr. Foreman, the property owners. My name is Delvin Mace. I live at 13212 NE Glory Road, Brush Prairie, Washington, I'm an architect representing the group. You have a packet that's being handed out to you. It's a packet that was given to Sandra Towne, Planner III, Department of Community Development Long-Range Planning. It contains information from the City of Ridgefield Planning Commission and the City of Ridgefield Council that reviewed and approved our property which is where the star is on 45th and south of Pioneer being included in their urban growth boundary.

The property is contiguous with the present city of Ridgefield on the east. We're in the process of developing the property which is 30 acres into a church property community and development. We've had a pre-application conference with the County and as a result of this pre-app conference we discovered that we as Ag-20 couldn't have a high school type schooling in our church as it is Ag-20 and outside of an urban growth boundary. We could have an elementary and a middle school if the majority of the students did not reside in an urban growth boundary and most of the congregation of our church lives inside an urban growth boundary. So the present location outside of UGB renders the school portion of our church not a very usable commodity.

As I mentioned, the property has been approved by the City of Ridgefield as being included in the UGB. We're in the process of proceeding with our conditional use permit

for the process. We do want to wait until the process for UGB has been resolved so that we can properly document our conditional use permit for the church. We will be developing the properties as a church. Approximately 60 percent of the 30 acres will remain in a greenbelt in the development and the site plan that you have before you there and so the school is the issue for the UGB. As the County development with the CUP we can develop the church self-contained on the site in the county and that's what our plans would be. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Mace?

BARCA: I'm lost. Which is the parcel we're talking about?

TOWNE: The one with the dot. Can you see that?

BARCA: Oh, the one with the dot. Yeah. Okay. In regard to that from staff's recommendation about this area can we review what that is just briefly because I notice the one with the dot is in with several that are colored different.

TOWNE: That's the city of Ridgefield, the ones that have --

LEE: It was part of City of Ridgefield's submittal to us in terms of what they recommended, it was not included in the proposed plan.

BARCA: Okay. That's what I was trying to clarify without having to go through my volumes.

MACE: The part -- the documentation that you have before you has their meetings that they approved it to be as a part of the UGB. It fell through the cracks because all of the properties that were really the issue was around I-5 corridor on the west end and this obviously just fell through the cracks because it was approved as you see in your documentation in their review as the properties and that's why we're here before you as at this meeting because it was -- I believe it was an oversight and the City of Ridgefield on their planning commission staff as well as their City Council approved it and you have the minutes before you of the approval. Also there's ordinances in there that they've already acted into ordinances.

LEE: It was actually the County Commissioners that have the authority to adjust urban growth boundaries as you're proposing, it is not the City of Ridgefield. The City can certainly recommend that the parcels be included and that is what the status is.

MACE: Exactly, that's what I'm trying to say is that it was recommended by.

LEIN: Any other questions?

BARCA: Not from me. Thanks.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Let's take a break right now and then we'll come back. Right now we have Don Kerkow. Sarah Munson; correct? Am I missing you? Did you come forward on something? Did I mention your name?

SERKOV: Yeah, you mentioned my name.

LEIN: And that is?

SERKOV: Peter Serkov.

LEIN: Okay. We'll come back and pick that up.

AUDIENCE: Could you give a few names further down the list.

LEIN: Let me go down after Ms. Munson. Mike Roth. Could you say if you're here or not. Mike Roth. Mark Erikson.

ERIKSON: Here.

LEIN: Jonathan Carter.

CARTER: Here.

LEIN: Jane Sassalos. Yes. Jane. Mike Smokey, I think that's right, S-m-o, he'll be at the next hearing, okay. Noreen Gierloff.

GIERLOFF: Yes.

LEIN: Gary Rademacher.

RADEMACHER: Here.

LEIN: Alison or Richard Strobel. Norman or Helen Parker. Mike Wynne.

WYNNE: Here.

LEIN: He's here. Treasure Delashaw. James Bristow. Mary Bristow. Sharon Martell.

MARTELL: No.

LEIN: Vickie Oates. Leo Oates.

OATES: Leo is here.

LEIN: Oh, we've got some more sign-ups, that's good. Pete Star, 1301 NE Whispering Winds. Selma Learner.

LOWER: Lower.

LEIN: Lower.

LOWER: Here.

LEIN: Okay. Brian Treasure. Neal or Paula Schoen. Tom Franzel. Larry Wilson.

AUDIENCE: Larry's not here but he's asked me to read his testimony if I might.

LEIN: Okay. Ron Warman. Mike Langsdorf.

LANGSDORF: Here.

LEIN: George Bateman. Robert Pettit. Bruce Neill.

NEILL: Here.

LEIN: Boleft. Gary Boleft, B-o-l-e-f-t. There's too many initials for that. The address is 18905 NE 83rd Street. Paul DeBoni.

DEBONI: Here.

LEIN: Vernon James.

JAMES: Here.

LEIN: Denise Cobb.

COBB: Pass.

LEIN: Thank you. Jerry Winters.

AUDIENCE: He's going to pass also.

LEIN: He's what?

AUDIENCE: He's going to pass also.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. H.N. Hassold. Michael O'Connell. Scott Miller. Jim Walker.

WALKER: Here.

LEIN: Rodney Smith.

SMITH: Here.

LEIN: Kylyn Johnson.

JOHNSON: Here.

LEIN: Doug Williamson. Doug Kolberg.

KOLBERG: Here.

LEIN: I may say your name again because you've signed up on the new one. Sharon Martell.

MARTELL: No.

LEIN: Okay, the Oates we've talked about. Bob Rodgers. Bob was signed up for the previous. Joe Lear was signed up for previous. Carl Templin.

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible).

LEIN: Okay. Charles Parsons.

PARSONS: Here. You had me on the earlier list there (inaudible).

LEIN: Okay. Henry Lasch we've heard from. Vernon James.

JAMES: Here.

LEIN: Kamee.

WILLIAMS: Kamee Williams, I'm here.

LEIN: Okay. And you want to testify?

WILLIAMS: Yes, please.

LEIN: Okay. Jim Sundal. That's a new name tonight. Okay. Jan Vis or Vis.

VIS: Here.

LEIN: Selma Learner.

LOWER: Lower.

LEIN: Lower. We've got your name twice here, don't we?

LOWER: Yes.

LEIN: Okay. I'll learn how to say it pretty soon. Rodney Troyer. Kathleen Troyer. No testimony?

AUDIENCE: They'll be back.

LEIN: Okay. Harold Hansen.

HANSEN: Here.

LEIN: Okay. Let me go through this on the break and I'll try to give you an idea when we come back how far I think we'll get. Thank you. We're going to take a break here.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to reconvene the hearing and continue on with our testimony. The first person would be Don Kerkow, then Sarah Munson, then Peter Serkov and then Charlie Parsons. Mr. Kerkow, please.

AUDIENCE: Are you going to give us an idea of --

LEIN: Oh, that's right, I'm sorry. I apologize, I got so far into this. The first hour and a half we went through basically nine people. We're going to try to go through at least 16. Those 16, the last person would be Robert Pettit. Let me give some last names here and I would recommend if you want to stay, that's fine, but there's no guarantee that we will get to you from here on. If not, the next public hearing is the 16th, 17th, 16th. Where's it at?

LEE: It's at the County Public Services Building, 6th Floor Hearing Room.

LEIN: 6th floor. Okay. So anyone we don't hear tonight you will be first on the agenda on the 16th starting at 6:30. So Bruce Neill, Paul DeBoni, Vernon James, Jim Walker, Rodney Smith, Kylyn Johnson, Doug Kolberg, Carl Templin. Now you may be on the other because I think there was two names for Mr. Wilson. Vernon James. Kamee, is that correct, okay, you can go home too. Jan Vis, Rodney Troyer, Kathleen Troyer,

Harold Hansen. Sorry for not trying to give you a better idea earlier, but we wanted to see how far we were going to be able to get and I don't want to hold you here tonight knowing that we can't get to you. So thank you for your --

AUDIENCE: So those names you just read, we get to go home?

LEIN: You get to go home, yes.

AUDIENCE: So will we get to testify next week, on the 16th?

LEIN: The 16th, a week from tonight. It's at the County Building, 6th Floor Hearing Room at 6:30. Everybody else we will try to get through this evening so we'd appreciate your testimony being succinct and we will continue on. Succinct or short, whichever is the best. Mr. Kerkow, thank you for your patience.

KERKOW: Thank you. My name is Don Kerkow. I live at 32016 NW La Center Road and I want to thank you for providing me the opportunity to be able to address my opposition to La Center's plan to extend the urban growth boundary south to Timmen Road and La Center Road. Up on the map, they put the map up for us so that we can talk about it, my property if you come over to the left more with the cursor to about, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going, right there, that's mine, those two, the 20 and the 30-acre parcel right there. My wife and I moved on to the property in 1993, a year before the current urban or the current comprehensive plan went into effect and the property we have is 17-acres forest along La Center Road and about 35 acres of wetland that extends down into the river. Since the time that we've moved on to the property we've watched La Center grow from a community of about 450, 500 people to upwards to 2,000.

All of the growth in La Center up to this point has been northeast and northwest of the city's core because they haven't been able to expand south of the river to this point. All of the property between La Center bridge which crosses the East Lewis River and the I-5 Junction is rural residential on acreage. Since I've moved on to the property La Center's been trying to determine a way that they can gain control over the property going out to the I-5 Junction. First, in 1994 they attempted to expand the urban growth boundary as part of the comprehensive plan which the County Commissioners ended up or the County Planning Commission ended up refusing. Then over the past two or three years they have been trying (inaudible) to get the landowners between La Center bridge and the I-5 Junction to go along with their plan to annex and have been very strongly objected against by the landowners. Now their plan is to try to do it incrementally, a step at a time, and the first step is to try and find a way to be able to convince the Planning Commission for the County that it's in everybody's best interest that they expand the urban growth boundary with a commercial node out to the Timmen Road and the Timmen Road and La Center Road.

Now I did very quickly last week provide a brief statement via E-mail because I had just found out about it about two days before from my neighbor and then today had an opportunity to put together a more comprehensive position of my opposition. In a memorandum from the City Council of La Center to the Planning Commission for the County on December 19th they stated that the Commission first considered trying to extend the urban growth area westerly to include I-5 Junction, but eventually concluded that the extension of the urban growth boundary in a cherry stem approach along La Center Road would not meet the criteria for the urban growth expansion. This fact coupled with the opposition of the property owners on the north side of La Center Road led the Commissioners to consider a different approach to extending the urban growth boundary across the East Fork of the Lewis River; i.e., developing the south side of Timmen Road, La Center Road Junction for employment and/or commercial use.

Later on Mr. Eisemann, who is the planner for the City was quoted during a meeting that showed up in the Reflector saying that trying to convince the planning council of the City of La Center that expanding the urban growth boundary would be a first step towards realizing the long-term goal of developing the La Center Junction. Their goal all along in everything they do is trying to get out to the La Center Junction to provide them the means to have a tax base from all that business that's going to be coming out there probably in 15 or 20 years to try and add supplement to all the tax base that they're already getting from the casinos downtown, more than they can actually spend. Right now my understanding is they run a surplus of several million dollars a year.

Patrick Lee in his memorandum to the Commission on September 10th, 2003 made some statements that I think very directly counteract what La Center's trying to do. The first statement says "alternatively those requests both urban and rural unrelated to urban growth area direction are not recommended in the proposed comprehensive planning map. Should the Planning Commission wish further to consider such requests Prosecuting Attorney advises that notice to the surrounding property owners on each side of the potential land use be notified." Did I use five minutes already? Oh, I'm sorry.

LEIN: Yes, it goes by fast when you're having fun.

KERKOW: Yeah, it does. The long and short of it is we were never notified. The last thing I want to say is they stated in their vision statement that by putting the urban growth and the commercial node it would help improve the visual gateway into the city. Right now we have as a visual gateway into the city of La Center we have rural residential leading into a very pristine and splendid wetland ending at the Lewis River where the bridge goes across the East Lewis River. I have a very hard time trying to understand how putting a strip mall with a stoplight at the corner of Timmen Road and La Center Road with fast food restaurants and small businesses is going to improve the visual gateway into the city. So what I hope is that once again the planning council will exercise their wisdom in disapproving La Center's request and keeping the property as it is to this point. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission? Thank you very much.

KERKOW: Thank you.

LEIN: Sarah Munson, please.

MUNSON: Hi, my name is Sarah Munson and I live at 17950 SE 41st Loop in Vancouver and I'm here tonight to ask you for your consideration to include my property out in northeast Ridgefield at 1120 NE 259th Street in Ridgefield be included in the new comprehensive plan. My property's the third property from the corner of NE 10th Avenue and NE 259th, very close to the new Dollar Tree Distribution Center. And right now my property is zoned Agricultural 20 acre minimum. There's an old barn and a 100-year old farmhouse on my property and I've had that property rented out now for several years. There's no agricultural activity on the property, it's a family living there.

And I'd like my property to be included in the comprehensive plan revision, first of all, because of the close proximity of the Dollar Tree Distribution Center and the other development going on at that area. I'd like to be able to develop my property eventually also and I think being included in the comprehensive plan would help facilitate that. Also, the current zoning there's between the commercial/industrial at the Dollar Tree and then the Agricultural 20 of the properties across the street is pretty abrupt, there's no transition or buffer at all, and I think that the industrial/commercial makes the rural area less, feel less rural. So I'm suggesting that it would make sense, I think, to have a buffer area created and I'm suggesting that that area could include some properties along NE 259th headed east and also along 10th as you go north towards an existing commercial area.

And then lastly, this property is my main savings for retirement and my husband and I had purchased it quite some time ago but had made a decision not to live there, we moved to Longview instead, otherwise I'd be looking at the Dollar Tree myself. And so I ask that you consider including this in the urban growth boundary of the comprehensive plan revision. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Munson? Thank you very much.

MUNSON: Thanks.

LEIN: Peter, please.

SERKOV: Peter Serkov is my name, and address is 3006 NE 199th.

LEIN: Peter, could you spell your last name?

SERKOV: S-e-r-k-o-v.

LEIN: Thank you.

SERKOV: That Sepicov sounds good too. And I bought that property a couple of years ago and this year Clark County bought a couple acres from me for wetland project and I just wind up with two acres and I didn't really have a choice. And under this proposal southeast corner of 29th and 199th is becoming commercial land and what they asking you if I can get included in that commercial zoning. I am good worker and I do everything from wood, you know, carving inlaid and I mean anything, (inaudible) cabinets for homes and I have small shop right now on my property which is too small for myself. If I can get -- if I can build bigger shop I can get, I can get couple employees and, you know, it can be Russian guys, you know, lots of Russian guys on welfare right now, on, you know, government support, you know, if I can take couple guys off of government and they can support themselves better and help me. So that's, I know everybody tired, but I think you can make right decision.

LEIN: Mr. Serkov, do you know what the property is currently zoned?

SERKOV: Well, on 199th it's zoned R-5, you know, for five, five acres, but there is like my neighbor's property is one acre and then next neighbor is like half acres, you know, so.

BARCA: We need some clarification. Excuse me, we need some clarification as to the property location.

LEIN: He did leave some information with us I think two meetings ago.

SERKOV: Yeah.

BARCA: Yeah. And that's what I was going to say, I'm not sure I've got it, but it's buried at the moment.

SERKOV: Yeah, it's northeast corner of 199th and 29th.

LEIN: Northeast.

MOSS: Okay, northeast corner.

SERKOV: Yeah. And southeast corner is commercial going in now.

LEE: Number 23.

BARCA: Okay, and that's very helpful.

LEIN: What's the number, Pat?

LEE: It's Number 23 in the packet you got a couple of weeks ago.

SERKOV: Is that it?

LEIN: Are there any other questions? Thank you.

BARCA: No, I just needed that clarification on the parcel.

SERKOV: Thank you.

LEIN: Charlie Parsons.

WYNNE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Mike Wynne, 1014 Franklin Street. And I have some other ones that I'll wait until later on, but Mr. Parsons, he's sitting right over there and we're in that Pleasant Highland area and we abut the big Philbrook farms 160-acre piece, we abut them to the north. We have approximately 11.65 acres. In three of the last five proposals we were proposed to be designated business park. We requested a, you know, a change from urban, excuse me, UR-10 to business park, but we would prefer to be piggy backing on with the Phil, you know, the big farm proposal that Mr. Schaefer was speaking on a few, a few hours ago. And we would also would urge that you support the recommendation from the Pleasant Highland Neighborhood Association that has gone on record of not requesting any business park designations out here but additional urban low density residential. And we have nothing further to add. I know it's getting late and there's some other folks here.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Wynne?

BARCA: This is 11.65 acres?

WYNNE: .65 acres. There's about four. It's been in the Parsons family for a long time and it abuts the Ag-20.

BARCA: The Philbrook farm parcel?

WYNNE: Yes. There it is right there.

BARCA: And that's 127 acres?

WYNNE: The Ag-20 is -- the Philbrook is 160 acre piece I think, isn't it?

TOWNE: No, 120.

WYNNE: 120, okay. Yeah, which is, you know, it's been a raspberry farm forever and they're just getting out of the raspberry business now.

BARCA: Okay. No more questions for him.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Wynne.

WYNNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LEIN: Get caught up here. Okay. Mark Erikson, Jonathan Carter and Noreen Gierloff.

HIROKAWA: Mr. Chairman, my name is Keith Hirokawa, I'm here on behalf of Mark Erikson and with John Carter. If it's all right that Mr. Carter's testimony will precede mine?

LEIN: That's fine.

CARTER: Great, thanks. Commissioners, thank you for hearing us tonight. My name is Jonathan Carter. I live on 12302 NE 66th Avenue in this portion right here in the new mixed use consideration. And I have a lot of empathy for Lee and Leon here with Lee's nice cream jacket that you heard her testimony and I've spent thousands of dollars to stand before you today, and on behalf of my 15 neighbors you've got written requests from a unanimous 15 that we feel that the zoning has been incorrectly considered mixed use as opposed to residential.

My wife and I, I'm going to give you my own story, my wife and I, my wife's a violinist for the Oregon Symphony and we came across here with our young family because I wanted my children to be able to grow up on acreage and so I looked over the county to find just a great piece of land and we totally bought into the Clark County comments of how wonderful a community it is and we agree with that and we love it where we live. So in doing so I planted 1,000 Douglas Fir around the outside of my property, I put in 400 blueberry bushes, 1,000 raspberry bushes, 40 grape vines and an orchard because I want my 2-year-old and 4-year-old to be able to just come out and pick fruit with me in the summer and enjoy the outdoors like I do and have a family home. Now this is a modest home, it's just a little ranch house, but it's the prettiest 5 acres in the county and we love it there.

And my neighbors likewise have come in here. The 2-acre parcel or the 6 acres next door to me or bordering me has just been cut up into 2-acre parcels and you've got three sisters that have dragged their husbands there because it's the prettiest part of the county to have their final retirement homes and sadly it is being rezoned mixed use. No one on the street was notified, they were horrified when I said to them, look, I just saw a map and it looks like we're all being considered for mixed use and they were like

it's not true. And so you've got signatures before you of all 15 that are saying, please, you know, we understand that the community's going to grow and we totally understand there's a lack of land in the community, otherwise prices wouldn't have gone for under 50,000 a lot two years ago to 67 today. So we understand there's been a \$20,000 hike in lots because there's a shortage of land, but we just think that this is a wrongful use.

This is a little one-lane country road, big red barns, cows, this is a pretty residential neighborhood, you've got the perfect neighborhood there and it's now being considered for mixed use, which, you know, 72nd which where 123rd if you can envision St. Johns and Andresen's coming together, there's the Chevron Station on the corner and then we're the very first block on the left. And it's hard enough now turning into our little residential street and the traffic growth count on there has grown by 20 percent per year. To detour off the main road for a mixed use when Gramor is putting in theoretically a huge retail division there on the corner and you've got lots of commercial land for sale down 72nd, my request, and real short, to you is, and we've put a proposal to you, that we move the mixed use along 119th and continue it up 72nd commercial and mixed use and keep this little one-lane country one road, one car road in the nice little neighborhood that it is, it's the perfect, you know, residence and that's my request of you.

LEIN: Mr. Carter, on the map is it the second map here that you're proposing that shows the extension down here?

CARTER: Exactly. If you notice the area it's all the properties that are, you know, adjacent 119th, which as I understand it if Gramor is bringing the sewer up from 50th, which is what I understand is happening, then in actual fact those properties will be able to access sewer and have their nice little mixed use and we can remain. I mean, honestly, you've just allowed someone to break ground next to me to put in his house. You've given me permission -- my wife's mother is a missionary from Brazil, she has no way of supporting herself, you've just allowed me to put a guest house which I was going to move my existing little modest ranch house into the back corner and you've given me permission to do that. Now under these rules I wouldn't be able to build my own home theoretically as I understand. I move her in and I'm out because I can't build my house now because it's a different zoning. That may or may not be true. I would ask you to consider to leave this zoning residential. We understand that if it comes in at what you're proposing, it's going to be a lot more residential, but isn't that better than my little girls having to live with a corner adult bookstore or something than, you know, a residence.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Carter?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. Just for clarification, what are the colors, the blue and the red and the --

CARTER: Right now this, this area right here is being, what's being considered for mixed use. My house is the X right there. So in actual fact you've got a double dog-leg here for traffic to go down to this one-lane road that dead-ends right here and so the road comes through here. All these neighbors, this has been cut into three pieces and they are breaking ground. They just poured the foundation of this house right here that you're going to make mixed use. So if that house burns down next week and he can't get that re -- as I understand it, can he build that house after you bring in this plan?

TOWNE: Yeah, you could rebuild.

DELEISSEGUES: So the yellow is residential?

LEIN: Yes, he can replace.

CARTER: Okay. So the residential right now you've got in through here and what we're asking is that you continue that residential for the entire street of 123rd so that you leave this residential.

DELEISSEGUES: No, I understand that. I just didn't know what the zoning was that's there now. That's what my question is, is the yellow and the blue and the red and so --

CARTER: 10 acres. Like right now this whole --

TOWNE: It's Urban Reserve 10 right now and he's drawn what the proposed plan would be.

CARTER: Right now if you look at this piece right here, this is your brown area that you've got right here and you'll see the pink piece right here. That's that pink piece right there. So the blue piece we have drawn is what you've got as mixed use on your map. You can see the industrial park the gentleman was talking about with the raspberry fields up here opposite the Highlands right here, this is St. Johns running up to 72nd which is an extremely busy street, you're almost rear-ended going down our country lane right here because there is no turn lane. So if you're going to put mixed use back in here does that mean you're going to put a light right here. Do you see what I'm saying? This is just great residential right in here, there's cows over here, there's a big red barn over here and I've put thousands of trees on this property in the last three years.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Carter?

BARCA: I have a question. Mr. Carter, what do you think "mixed use" is?

CARTER: Mixed use as I understand it is condos, townhomes, but as I understand Mr. Printz last week I think designated it pretty well as to what mixed use is and that is that

25 percent has to be commercial or retail. Is that inaccurate?

TOWNE: I can clarify that.

BARCA: I was looking more for perception as opposed to the actualities.

CARTER: Is now Mr. Printz accurate that a portion needs to be commercial and his argument was how hard it is to put that commercial in because of the fact that -- could you clarify?

TOWNE: Yeah. The mixed use allows for R-12 or higher residential zoning density and you can have office, residential and commercial, those three are allowed, and the mix is can be varied but you can't have any more than 70 percent of one of those uses.

CARTER: So you've got to mix the use and, you know, Mr. Printz was saying how tough that it is anyway, but, you know, like Lee and Leon were saying, I mean the bottom line is we moved in here for residential, you allowed us to put up new buildings, new homes, approval for a guest house and ultimately the way I see it ultimately we're going to have to move.

LEIN: Any other questions?

BARCA: None from me.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

CARTER: Thank you for your time.

HIROKAWA: Good evening, my name is Keith Hirokawa, I am here with Mr. Carter and specifically want to comment on the legal issues that were alluded to because I think that the mixed use designation I understand that a lot of comments last week were pretty negative about the mixed use issue. I have some thoughts on this and I think we can start there if that's okay. Would you put that last one back up real quick. Thanks.

Here's my first problem with it, when you put -- mixed use has a requirement, a minimum requirement of either commercial or residential they have to be together, all right, so you can't, you, sorry, so a property owner or a developer cannot go forward with whatever happens to be economically viable at the time, the residential is selling, we'll do the residential today, tomorrow we'll do some sort of commercial use, it doesn't work like that. Without the percentages, without both the commercial and the residential working together you can't have any of it. Okay. Now the problem with that, and actually before that, the other issue is for clarification on what is allowed in mixed use we know that single-family detached are prohibited, okay, because the mixed use ordinance specifically references C-3 and says permitted conditional or prohibited as in

C-3, and when you look down to the C-3 zoning it says single-family detached are prohibited. Okay. Now there's an importance there I think for an existing neighborhood of single-family detached, it creates nonconforming uses for all of them.

Now the nonconforming use, and this is where things are kind of funny, a nonconforming structure that under the Clark County Code for any cause loses 60 percent of its value is considered as a matter of law demolished. Now the funny thing about that is let's say somebody comes in next door to Mr. Carter or any of his neighbors and brings in the commercial use, perhaps maybe one that's conditionally allowed in the mixed use that's a little more intensive and because the use that is nonconforming is the single-family residential that's what is valued, right, that's sort of the relevant parcel, the relevant use, if that use is devalued by more than 60 percent, as a matter of law under the code he can't use it for that anymore. Now I know it sounds technical and kind of funny, but it's putting this mixed use onto an existing single-family detached residential neighborhood that causes the problems. That's one of the problems I think.

Number two, when you introduce the mixed use into an existing neighborhood, you inevitably have problems with what can actually be used as a mixed use because if it's expressly permitted, so be it, but the conditional uses, as you know from the Clark County Code conditional uses may not be permitted if the use is injurious to any person who resides, and of course single-family residential is defined as that kind of use, any person that resides in that neighborhood or injurious to property, so loss of property value of a single-family residential use property value would not allow any of these conditional uses in the existing residential neighborhood.

Now third problem, and here's the Constitutional issue, and I attached with the handouts some quotes that were entitled subtitled Regulatory Takings, and the provision, it starts halfway down through the first paragraph, "the application of a general zoning law to particular property effects a taking if the ordinance does not substantially advance legitimate state interests," and I'm going to address both of these, or number two, "denies an owner economically viable use of its land." Now these have been interpreted and re-interpreted and whatnot from the courts and this language actually starts from the Lucas case in the U.S. Supreme Court. Now I think both of these issues "substantially advances" and "economically viable" use are pretty important for the purpose of the mixed use designation.

Substantially advances. In Patrick Lee's memorandum from June 12th to you it was clearly noted that the County does not need any more commercial designations to satisfy the population. Okay. There's not a necessity here. And so at this point more designations for these commercial are strategic. And that's what's in the memorandum. And Gramor's going in on the corner. Do you mind if I conclude with this real quick?

LEIN: Yeah, briefly.

HIROKAWA: So the "substantially advances," and the Supreme Court is very clear about this, that "substantially" is that heightened standard of review that says they want to see that whatever the particular zoning designation is actually is needed to perform or to obtain the result that is the legitimate state interest. Now the second problem of this is the economically viable use. And here's the thing, when you know that the mixed use does not allow single-family detached, which has always historically been the escape valve, all right, if it looks like there's a taking of property, too much of a public use, a regulatory taking for instance, but you can still build a single-family house, detached house, then there's not going to be a taking because there's still economically viable use, but your mixed use ordinance does not allow single-family detached, which means the County will have to mix it up in litigation with property owners that can't make the commercial part work. And if the commercial part can't work, then as you know from the mixed use ordinance, they can't build any of it because until they have both parts, none of it can be permitted.

Now like I said, a lot of this has been litigated, a lot of people still don't know what it means. And by "people" we get a lot of mixed versions from the courts, but we know your mixed use ordinance is going to cause problems for those like in this neighborhood, all right, competitively disadvantaged because it's tucked away off of the arterials, hilly, vegetated, because of there are new homes in this area, it's going to be difficult to put together a parcel that can be competitive with Gramor's proposed development right across 72nd right there. We're tucked away back here, smaller parcels, it's not going to be easy to be competitive. All right. It is very possible that there will be no economically viable commercial uses, which means under your ordinances there will be no economically viable uses at all. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Hirokawa?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, I've got a question on this last page of your handout. The second paragraph where it says "otherwise valid zoning ordinance that deprives the owner of the most beneficial use of his property would not be unconstitutional or would not be constitutional or would be unconstitutional"?

HIROKAWA: Let's see. Oh, last sentence?

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah. It seems like it would be either would be unconstitutional or would not be constitutional.

HIROKAWA: You know, I'll have to go back and look at that language, but to tell you the truth I think that what that's saying is --

DELEISSEGUES: It doesn't make sense.

HIROKAWA: -- that they're focusing on the most beneficial use and in that particular instance it was not like here, the thing was, well, I can make more profit if you let me have this kind of zoning, bigger building, whatever the case may be more intensive, and the takings challenge, the constitutional challenge, was denied because there was still economically viable use left, you can still build a single-family home.

DELEISSEGUES: No, I mean just the last part of that sentence doesn't seem to go with the "otherwise valid zoning ordinance." I mean if it was a valid ordinance, then it would be constitutional; if it's otherwise valid it would be it seems to me unconstitutional, but --

HIROKAWA: I agree with you.

DELEISSEGUES: -- I thought I'd check with you.

HIROKAWA: It seems I can't explain that, it must be a typo.

BARCA: I have a question as well. Can you possibly put up the alternative proposal.

HIROKAWA: It's the next page. Thank you.

BARCA: Now for me to try and get some clarity in your argument because you have limited the parcels along 119th to road frontage pieces and nothing behind those, you're saying, then, that those particular parcels do have the opportunity to utilize the mixed use ordinance effectively and therefore on those parcels based on you bringing this forward, you're saying that there would be no Constitutional issue with those being zoned in that fashion?

HIROKAWA: Oh, no, sir. I'm not going that far. I'm not sure how that would play out in a parcel that is well-situated on a well-traveled road. Specifically we're referencing the parcels that are not, that are hidden away, tucked away off of the arterials. I mean I understood if you're asking me to justify why we should go along 119th, I'm not a planner unfortunately and I would just say that they would be more competitive in terms of --

CARTER: Going off the discussion was that Gramor is going in on the corner of 119th and 72nd, you've got competing retail commercial stuff right there, at least this is visible from the street, anything tucked in the back, people don't even know it's there, why would they drive down a little country lane to maybe find a Blockbuster Video when at least it's visible coming down 119th.

BARCA: Okay. Knowing the way that commercial property develops it's rare for the existing country lanes to be the primary transportation mode when it's all said and done and developed. Exclusive of that argument I was trying to understand why one

proposal which was put forward, the original County proposal, you had a very strong argument against, but then you made a counterproposal and you as his representative I believe was then up here to say that this proposal was a counterproposal that you and your client were offering and so in that regard I was trying to understand why through your logic that those other pieces were viable for mixed use, but the parcels directly behind them would not be viable within the contention that it could all be one development and there would be a large amount of 119th Road access.

HIROKAWA: Right. In other words what you're saying is let's say we punch through somewhere over here and access those parcels, I'm not sure that's in front of us today particularly because as these are the residential parcels along 124th, those are the parcels that we don't think the owners are going to give up, I mean, short of eminent domain to access into that neighborhood. I don't think they're similarly situated properties there.

CARTER: And they're the ones that have signed each of them individually and have been in front of you asking if they could change their designation to residential.

BARCA: All right. And I do understand what your dilemma is as you see it, and I do understand the aspect, I was really trying to more understand the idea that you came forward with a counterproposal as opposed to just straightforward saying this group of people really prefer not to have any change whatsoever, but you went beyond that.

CARTER: I'm sorry, Ron, that's what we were advised to do is that the County's going to look for mixed use somewhere, they've already designated most of these properties and it was a logical, it was a logical -- you were looking for an answer so my understanding was that there would need to be some counter plan. And so if there is a counter plan, then why not the busy street of 119th as opposed to a little county lane. Why not extend along 119th a few lots to get your needed amount of mixed use. If that's what, if that's what the County needs, then why not keep it on a busy road and that was the discussion, but there would need to be a second plan. No, I don't, I'm not into the second plan, I'm just asking from the residents, the 15 families involved who want to stay there that would be okay with
a -- I mean we want to -- you're going to promote growth so, you know, could we at least stay residential.

BARCA: Okay. Then after hearing what you're both saying I think what I would like to do for the record is say that the second sheet is not a counterproposal that you're submitting.

HIROKAWA: Right.

BARCA: It's just a potential idea --

HIROKAWA: Right.

BARCA: -- but it is not a counterproposal from you then?

HIROKAWA: That would be fine.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Any other questions?

CARTER: Thanks, Commissioners.

LEIN: Thank you.

HIROKAWA: Thank you.

LEIN: Noreen Gierloff and then Gary Rademacher and then Mr. Wynne.

GIERLOFF: Hi. I'm Noreen Gierloff from 716 NW 179th Street and all I had to say is we are pleased with our property to be changed to urban residential which we submitted a site-specific request earlier for and we feel our property being located on NW 179th Street near the Safety Complex and the amphitheater it's well-suited to be urban residential and that's all I had to say.

LEIN: Any questions? That was a nice easy one. Thank you. That's my favorite testimony. And after Mr. Wynne would be Vickie or Leo Oates.

RADEMACHER: Thank you for hearing me. My name is Gary Rademacher. I live at 19619 NE 68th Street, Vancouver, Washington. I represent the landowners in this 45-acre piece right here. And this 5 --

LEIN: Gary, can you give us some streets, cross streets, please.

RADEMACHER: This is 117th, this is 119th right here.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

RADEMACHER: And this is 99th Street right here, right here, excuse me. This 5 acres of ML is already in the existing growth boundaries, and so is this 10 acres, this 30 acres also have option, has been brought in, but it has been brought in as mixed use and I don't think it should be mixed use, I think it should be R1-6. As you can see from this aerial photo I don't think there's a more natural progression of R1-6 anywhere else in the county. If you're going to do all your commercial needs are met out here on 117th, this is Prairie High School to give you some reference.

Now the ground I have option ends right here, but the thing that I don't understand is this is Westminster Walk here, these are two and a half to three and a half acre pieces, this is also in the red area that's outlined here, this is also projected to come in to the GMA, but they are bringing it in as R1-6. Now as you can see there's three more home sites to be built out here. This is a photo that was only taken 30 days ago. These homes in here range from 700,000 to a million plus and I don't see any way that this could develop in the next 10 years with this R1-6 zoning. So there's a hundred acres plus here that's going to be counted as R1-6 that is not going to develop in the next 10 years. They got covenants that run longer than that that keep them from developing. I have sewer and water right here and I have sewer and water right here, they're on PUD water and they have no sewer to them at all. If I get the right zoning and I develop this, then sewer will be adjacent to them, but I do not, I do not understand this.

And it's my request, and I put in a request for this ML, this 5 acres was changed in '96. This is a garbage transfer station right here was put in, the County changed this from R-10 to ML on their own and she's been trying to sell it for the past three years as ML and she's not been able to because it doesn't have any commercial exposure out to 117th. This is a church right here that goes all the way out to 117th, so and with these already being inside the urban growth boundary I'm not sure, this 5 acres and these two two and a halves that have existing homes is zoned R-10 so we've got a real hodgepodge right now.

But it is my request to you folks tonight that this be brought in as R1-6 or low urban density instead of mixed use, this is and these also, this entire 45-acre piece, which is a natural progression to continue. This is Wolf Creek I and this is Wolf Creek II. And that's all I have to say. And I'm willing to give you the photo.

LEIN: Thank you. Any questions of --

RADEMACHER: Any questions?

LEIN: -- Mr. Rademacher?

BARCA: A question for staff actually. Do you have the ability to give me the number in relationship to exhibit or testimony for --

RADEMACHER: The case number? Is that what --

BARCA: Case number, I don't know of case numbers.

LEE: The case number in the booklet that you got with the spreadsheet which just gives you a brief summary of what the request is is SSR2003-009A.

BARCA: 009A.

LEE: Yeah. The property owner is Embry and Gary is the representative.

BARCA: And was there any submitted written testimony?

RADEMACHER: I didn't bring it with me tonight but I'll get it turned in to you.

BARCA: Oh, so you haven't turned in anything yet?

RADEMACHER: No.

BARCA: Okay.

LEE: But we do have the whole file request for the site-specific information.

BARCA: Okay. Keep the photo.

RADEMACHER: Okay, thank you.

MOSS: Just a comment to the staff if I could too. I appreciate, Mr. Rademacher, you bringing up the Westminster Walk issue too and that's one that I'm going to want to talk about sometime later. And my reaction has been so far pretty much the same as yours, that I don't see that developing at all and yet it's kind of the centerpiece of the residential addition in that area. Thanks.

RADEMACHER: This Westminster Walk is very similar in size and acreage to what the home builder represent, talked about of the one to two acres that they figure there will be 70 percent conversion instead of the 28 percent conversion in the next 10 years. I can and I think we could pretty safely say that this is not going to resubdivide in the next 10 years.

MOSS: Well, my bet is that not, no lot in there will resubdivide.

RADEMACHER: Any other questions?

LEIN: Any questions?

LEIN: Thank you.

MOSS: Thanks.

RADEMACHER: Thank you.

LEIN: Mr. Wynne, followed by one or both of the Oates and then Selma Lower.

WYNNE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Mike Wynne, 1014 Franklin Street and I represent Nick and Joan Weber. And there is a specific case number. We submitted this request in August of this year. They own 40 acres directly south right across the street from the amphitheater. They've been out there for, you know, a number of years. Their current designation is Urban Reserve, UR-10, and I believe that you've already heard from the first speaker tonight about all the activity that's obviously happened out there. We've had the amphitheater, we've got the sports complex being proposed, the 80 acre sports complex and substantial public investments that the Clark County Fairgrounds is going to conduct, you know, this year. We've been covered or at least proposed at various uses, the three out of your five, the most recent one I believe is business park and we would recommend that you follow the staff's recommendation I believe on that to a business park designation. And we feel that the 40.5 acres would lend itself to a nice master plan business park and all services are available. There's been, there will be some substantial, more public investments out there. And that's all I have to add unless you have any questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Wynne?

MOSS: Would you identify this property again?

WYNNE: It's as the tax serial number is 182138-000. And, Sandra, it's the Nick and Joan Weber. Do you have the SR number on that?

TOWNE: Yeah, it's right up here, 2003-045. And the dot marks the spot.

WYNNE: Yeah, right now we, you know, we're growing strawberries and stuff there, and we have for the last 20 years, and they've been real happy with the amphitheater, you know, probably it's a better neighbor than when that ten day old Clark County Fair is and, you know, you're back in August. But things have changed out there the last 10 years.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Wynne? Thank you.

WYNNE: Thank you.

LEIN: Oates, anybody here from the Oates? There was some information submitted by Leo and Vickie Oates. Also the names on it were Sharon Newberry Martell and John and Twila Lamb concerning the Rushing River Estates, so we've got that for our record. Okay, please. Brian Treasure would be after this. Is Brian here?

LOWER: Thank you. My name is Selma Lower and I'm here to represent Rolling Hills Estates Phase III. We're here to basically oppose the 219th Interstate exchange. We

the collective property owners of Rolling Hills Estates Phase III in Ridgefield, Washington oppose the I-5/SR-502 interchange and the corridor widening proposal as outlined on the Web site. We oppose the project on the basis that it will significantly lower the value of all properties in Rolling Hills III, increase in noise level, and cut directly through several properties within Rolling Hills Phase III.

For the record my name is Selma Lower, my property information is 21611 NW 5th Avenue, Ridgefield, Washington, Tax Parcel 104, Section 3 T39 or T3N R1EWM and Parcel Number 106. And the property that is affected with the frontage street coming from 219th is about either 15 to 20 acres, depending on which design we last looked at on the web site. That's all I have.

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Lower?

BARCA: My clarification on this, is it 5-acre parcels?

LOWER: Basically Rolling Hills Estates III is 5-acre parcels at this time so we're 5-acre minimums. And there's 27 lots associated with Rolling Hills Estates III and there's basically five lots that would be affected by the 219th interchange with the stub coming out and the frontage street going down and connecting up to Delfel Road.

DELEISSEGUES: Could you point that out on the map, you know, where the property is and where the proposed interchange is?

LOWER: Sure.

TOWNE: I don't have the map.

LOWER: It's right at the Gee Creek rest area so it's right in this area here.

DELEISSEGUES: Your property's on the east side of I-5?

LOWER: West side.

BARCA: West side.

DELEISSEGUES: It's an eye test from here on that little map so --

LOWER: Sorry.

DELEISSEGUES: -- I can't tell.

TOWNE: Just one minute and Evan will have it.

LEIN: Evan can find it.

MOSS: Yeah, it's the one with the dot.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, Vaughn, there goes your timetable.

LEIN: There goes my five minutes, isn't it.

LOWER: And I was doing really well. I like paraphrased.

DELEISSEGUES: Evan Dust gets on the high-tech equipment over there we're doomed.

LOWER: Basically there's been a couple of different proposals where it would be stubbed or else it would run up to 11th or it would run passed 11th up to 31st, so there's a couple of different proposals on the table.

TOWNE: Are you looking at the map?

LEE: It's not projecting on the screen.

DUST: There we go.

TOWNE: Right there.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. Now where's the property?

TOWNE: You'll have to show us. If you could come over that would be great.

LOWER: So where is -- can you show me where 11th is?

TOWNE: 11th is right here.

LOWER: Okay, 11th is there. See the right down a little bit, down by your hand, oh, a little bit up to that road right there, that road runs down, that's 216th, then the parcels that would be affected is the next one to the right.

TOWNE: This on?

LOWER: Yeah, that one. And the next one to the right and then to the down and the next one down to the right.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay. So you're right there on the interchange.

LOWER: These right in here.

BARCA: Yeah, see the big bulge, that's the Gee Creek rest area.

DELEISSEGUES: Okay, thank you.

LOWER: And 219th is on the other side.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you, Evan.

LOWER: Thank you. Anything else?

LEIN: Thank you very much.

LOWER: Thank you.

LEIN: Larry Wilson or someone.

TEMPLIN: My name is Carl Templin, I work for Larry Wilson at Wilson & Associates Architects. Our office is at 404 East 15th Street, Suite No. 7, Vancouver, Washington 98663. Wilson & Associates represents Hank and Bernice Boschma who own approximately 170 acres of 419 acres that we have outlined at the Ridgefield Junction area which we're proposing to be included in the Ridgefield UGA. And we also represent POB Montgomery Group who is a developer out of Dallas, Texas who is interested in up to 150 acres of that land out there. They do primarily industrial and commercial development there I believe. We have been working with the City of Ridgefield for the past two years in developing a capital facilities study for the expansion of the Ridgefield UGA. What you have there is a couple of maps listing the property owners within those Maps A and B, as well as behind that is the facilities analysis.

The plan shown on Exhibit A, the 419 acres, has been submitted to the City Planning Commission and the City Council at Ridgefield at the public hearings in April and May of this year and the request has been approved by both hearings. The property is bounded by 11th Avenue on the west, 10th Avenue on the east, 279th Street on the north and 264th Street on the south. The entire west and south property lines on that page about the existing Ridgefield city boundaries so we're looking at this request as an (inaudible) request and vital to the economic future of Ridgefield. The property south of the site is known as Union Ridge Project. That is currently being developed by the Schuck Corporation. On September 8th we met with the three County Commissioners individually to present this request and to supply them with the information that we've just passed out to you here and all three of the Commissioners indicated support for the request and ask that we would present it to you tonight.

The City of Ridgefield did not participate in the UGA process when the first DEIS was

drafted, but has assisted us in development and review of their capital facilities study which is in the packet there and was presented to the Commissioners on the 8th of September and to staff on the 25th of September. We believe, as does the City of Ridgefield, that the Junction property shown on Map A is appropriate for inclusion in the UGA expansion this year. The capital facilities analysis is based on the entire 419 acres shown on Map A and assumes 20 percent commercial located near the Junction, 15 percent residential located in and around existing established neighborhoods. There's a -- I think there's about between 6 and 9 one-acre residential subdivision there and the majority of the remaining parcels are Ag-20 at this time and 65 percent industrial located on the balance of the property to the easterly portion of the site. The property shown on Exhibit A has approximately 80 acres of wetlands and wetland buffers which would reduce the amount of developable land to approximately 340 acres.

This request meets the intent of the Clark County comprehensive plan by providing developable lands within the immediate vicinity of the I-5/Pioneer Street Junction and it makes common sense to in-fill and square the box of the city boundary to the south and west and incorporate the entire 419 acres shown on Map A. And this request is financially feasible based on the capital facilities plan or capital facilities study, I'm sorry, and we respectfully request your approval on that.

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Planning Commission?

RUPLEY: Is this similar to what the Port of Ridgefield testified on last week? Are you supporting theirs or is it different?

TEMPLIN: I was not here last week so I'm not sure what they requested.

LEE: It's a different parcel.

RUPLEY: It is a different parcel?

LEE: Different parcel, yeah.

TOWNE: It's south of.

LEE: I believe Larry Wilson was here last week and did testify to it and I think in the presentation that Ridgefield presented on September 25th, they also recommended its inclusion in the UGA.

RUPLEY: Thank you.

LEIN: A quick clarification. Your Exhibit A, on the east side along NE 10th it says "proposed UGA expansion line." That's your proposal; is that correct?

TEMPLIN: That's our proposal, yes.

LEIN: And B is as proposed?

TEMPLIN: B was -- A is what we're proposing and the City of Ridgefield is also supporting, B was a, would be a compromise of --

LEIN: So it's a compromise, okay. Any other questions? Thank you.

TEMPLIN: Thank you.

BARCA: Excuse me, there is one thing. You said B is a compromise.

TEMPLIN: Should you guys not decide to recommend the full 419 acres our next step would be to use the plan B.

BARCA: Oh, okay. So this isn't a negotiated compromise with another party, this is just an alternate proposal?

TEMPLIN: Alternate proposal, yes.

LEE: I think the City of Ridgefield also stated a similar position that maybe a lesser urban growth boundary expansion and a portion in urban reserve instead as an alternative or backup position.

BARCA: Yeah, I just needed that clarification on who we were compromising with, so thank you.

TEMPLIN: Thank you.

LEIN: Next we have Ron Warman, Mike Langsdorf and then Robert Pettit. Mr. Warman. Mr. Warman's not here. Okay. Mr. Langsdorf.

LANGSDORF: I'm on deck and up to bat. Almost made it to the last speaker tonight. I presently represent -- my name is, sorry, my name is Mike Langsdorf. My address is 1915 Washington, I'm an attorney, I'm representing Jim and Laurie Walker who are the owners of a farm that's on 10th Avenue top at the north is 279th and --

TOWNE: This is 10th Avenue.

LANGSDORF: It's, yes, that's along the north and then down to -- well, do you want me to draw it for you or do you got it?

TOWNE: What do you want me to draw?

LANGSDORF: The boundaries of the property. That's correct. Thank you.

DELEISSEGUES: So what are those streets then?

LANGSDORF: What are the streets?

BARCA: It looks like there's already a subdivision.

TOWNE: To the north is 279th.

LANGSDORF: 279th.

TOWNE: To the west is 10th Avenue.

DELEISSEGUES: Thank you.

LANGSDORF: Initially the Walkers submitted their application to Clark County on October 31st of 2002, a response came back from the County, from Sandra Towne, on November 12th, 2002, eventually we got a SSR number which was SSR2003-044. After that we started attending Planning Commissions for meetings with the City of Ridgefield. The City of Ridgefield Planning Commission recommended that this be UG-20X for the property and the adjacent properties which was Helen's View I and II plus some of the properties further to the south. We then appeared in front of the City Council on several occasions and on October, I'm sorry, on June 25th, 2003, the recommendation was made that this property be UH-20X along with a reserve area further to the south all the way down -- if you look at the property on 22nd Avenue they brought the reserve area off 10th, over to 22nd, down to Carty Road, and from Carty Road over to I-5 which was the adopted plan, approved by the City of Ridgefield, but it wasn't approved very fast in accordance with the process we've had going on.

They completed on the 26th, they submitted it to the County on June 30th and the very next day the County was adopting the initial plan to run by you and by everyone else. It was in too late. It couldn't be included. My purpose of being here tonight is to try and hope that you will re-include at least portions of the plan as it applies to Mr. Walker's property. One of the interesting things I found in the process is that we spoke to a lot of neighbors, and you can see neighbors to the north, those neighbors have signed petitions to you asking that their property and Mr. Walker's property be included within the urban growth boundary for Ridgefield. I have those and I will pass those back to you tonight.

There's a couple things that I think that are important to be looked at carefully and that is what about utilities. Do we have utilities to the site. And the answer is, yes, we got water to the site, we got electricity to the site, we got cable TV to the site, we have a fire

station that is slightly over a half a mile to the south on 10th Avenue and water and sewer capacities are being upgraded, developed on 10th Avenue. Water also comes down 279th Street from 10th, the east. I believe that when the Boschma and Dollar Store Distribution Centers are completed, you're going to see more utilities developed on the property. I think the thing that's difficult for my client is he's designated as Ag-20, he's got Boschma below, he's got the Dollar Store, he's got all of this land that he used to use for farming is gone. He used to think he could farm this property and at least get one family wage job, he's discovered that's not true, both he and his wife work off the farm so that they can support the farm and their family.

I think when we think about where we would like to work and where we want to live, all of us who work in Oregon or those of us who do work in Oregon would just as soon work on this side of the river if they can. The problem with parceled lands we need according to CREDC is that we need parcels that are at least 100 acres in size to attract the correct -- or give the variety to the developers who are coming to the area. There are not that many 100 plus acres of parcels of land zoned for industrial or industrial holding. We would ask that you consider this parcel under the UH-20X which would allow the property to be developed when and if it's annexed into the city and the utilities are present to the property to provide to a developer of that property. Thank you. Any questions?

LEIN: Could we have a definition of the UH-20X?

LEE: Yeah. I think the original site-specific request that came to us was suggesting an urban reserve designation. A UH-20X we think that might -- is that a City of Ridgefield designation? So I think a question is, you know, the original proposal was for urban reserve, not to come into the urban growth boundary. We have the UH, urban holding designation, but I don't believe that is what Mr. Langsdorf is referring to.

LANGSDORF: The urban holding, yes, we are. That's what we're requesting it for.

LEE: Is it. Urban holding and with what would be the underlying use.

LEIN: What's the 20X?

LEE: 20-acre minimum lot size I presume.

LANGSDORF: To make sure that the property has to stay at at least 20 acre size, there cannot be further parcelization.

MOSS: Mike, the underlying zone that you're recommending is industrial?

LANGSDORF: Yes, UH-20, which we want as proposed as industrial which the people who attended the hearings knew that that's where we were going and they -- and I

apologize for not passing this up sooner, here is a bunch of petitions signed by the people in the neighborhood supporting this move. And they had gone to the Planning Commission hearings, they had gone to the City of Ridgefield meetings and they join with Mr. Walker in asking the property to be placed in this designation which we had heard from Mr. Lowry was the appropriate position to place this property so that it could come in at the appropriate time but not have to wait necessarily 10 or 20 years.

TOWNE: May I clarify something?

LANGSDORF: Yeah.

TOWNE: Originally the request was for Urban Reserve 20 --

LANGSDORF: That's what we have it for.

TOWNE: -- and that's a rural zone outside and so you are asking for Urban Holding 20 which would be included in the urban growth boundary line?

LANGSDORF: That's correct. But if you put us as UR, that's what you do, but like I say, that's what Mr., yeah, that's what you said is absolutely correct.

BARCA: Can I get a clarification on what appears to be the fingers of subdivision that has gone on in --

LEE: Yeah, that is a cluster residential subdivision approved prior to that particular ordinance being repealed so I believe it's -- I'm not sure of the lot size, but there's a Phase I and a Phase II and just I will say that we have also heard from residents of that subdivision and they do not appear, the names do not appear on the list that I saw Mr. Langsdorf handing out in support of this proposal because they have expressed opposition to such a proposal to us before.

LANGSDORF: I'll have to check with the list. All I'm saying is we got the majority of the people, that's what I was told by Mr. Walker who's also present here with his wife. If they could testify out of turn since Mr. Walker had a stroke about three weeks ago and staying up late is not his favorite thing.

LEIN: Mr. Walker, would you like to make some comments?

WALKER: Yes, I do.

LEIN: Please.

WALKER: My name is Jim Walker and I live at 27201 NE 10th Avenue. My wife and I bought our farm in 1991. At the time we were able to run about 400 head of cattle. We

were able to support that many by using our own 104 acres for discharging waste, leasing other local properties for crops. Now we can only support 150 head because a lot of the ground is no longer available. The area currently being developed by the Dollar Tree and the Schuck Corporation alone used to provide us with as much as 290 ton of hay. Now we also used to harvest hay from the property that is now Rolling Hills Estate. While there may still be ground available to lease in the area, most of it is too small and spread out to be feasible. There is also an issue of moving tractors and equipment down the road. In recent years traffic has increased to the point that it has become very hazardous.

Clark County has lost so many farms, cease operations in the last 10 years that there are no longer any local tractor dealerships making parts and repairs more difficult. Because of this these changes in and around the Junction farming has become nearly impossible. The farms can no longer support our family. In fact my wife and I both work outside jobs during the day and do farm work in the evenings and weekends. This has caused a lot of stress for our family. I am dealing with health issues having been diagnosed with heart problems and more recently suffered a mild stroke. We feel that it is unfair and unrealistic for the County to expect our family to farm in an area that has already been developed to some degree. We respectfully request the County to include our property in the current growth management area of Ridgefield so our family can survive. Thank you very much.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Walker? Thank you, sir. Robert Pettit. Mr. Pettit is not here. Is there anyone else here wishing to testify? If not, that concludes tonight's hearing. For some reason we zipped through these others real quick. Thank you, people.

MOSS: Should we try to call any of those other folks back that left?

LEIN: Mr. Lee's sitting there going I told you so, I told you so.

LEE: I am.

LEIN: I'll have to listen to you again. That concludes tonight's public hearing.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

LEIN: Are there any comments from members of the Commission?

MOSS: That's a nice short hearing, Vaughn. You are getting better, this made up for the last one.

LEIN: Yeah, thanks.

RUPLEY: We can all go to work tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed By:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SW\Min 10-09-2003